DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 249 907 HE 017 816

AUTHOR	Ceyhun, Fikret
TITLE	The Significance of "Problem-Posing" Teaching in a Democratic Society. College Teaching Monograph.
INSTITUTION	North Dakota Univ., Grand Forks. Office of Instructional Development.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	49p.
AVAILABLE FROM	University of North Dakota, Office of Instructional Development, Box 8161, University Station, Grand Forks, ND 58202.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Instruction; Conventional Instruction; Course Content; Creative Teaching; Discussion (Teaching Technique); *Economics Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; Learning Motivation; *Questioning Techniques; Student Participation; Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	University of North Dakota

ABSTRACT

A new teaching methodology, the "problem-posing" approach, is advocated in place of the traditional system of education. Experience in teaching the "Principles of Economics" course at the University of North Dakota is used as illustration. The problem-posing approach can create a learning atmosphere that is more conducive to creative and critical thinking. The approach is designed to increase student motivation, learning, and participation. It also increases students' understanding of the business world and political and social influences. One aspect of the approach is the requirement that students write biweekly essays in reaction to articles dealing with current socioeconomic problems. Both the method and the content of the course are continuously revised and updated to pose challenging and creative questions. Students and teachers are co-partners in the learning process. This approach is consistent with the principles of a democratic society, while the traditional system is not. The problem-posing approach will eliminate superiority/inferiority relationships among teachers and students. Traditional education leads the student to mechanical memorization without giving them an understanding of the significance of the memorized materials. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED249907

COLLEGE TEACHING MONOGRAPH

The Significance of "Problem-Posing" Teaching in a Democratic Society

by

Fikret Ceyhun
Department of Economics
University of North Dakota

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Office of Instructional Development, Univ. of North Dakota

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by
The Office of Instructional Development
University of North Dakota

HE017 916

Requests for copies
should be made to
Office of Instructional Development
Box 8161, University Station
Grand Forks, ND 58202

© 1984, Fikret Ceyhun
All Rights Reserved

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

Good college teaching is marked by intensity of feeling for subject, students, and teaching itself. Professor Fikret Ceyhun reflects such an intensity in this monograph. Beginning with a Marxist view of society, a commitment to democracy, and a belief in the role of education in social progress, Ceyhun describes an approach to the teaching of a large introductory course--the Principles of Economics. He provides examples of both content and method that contributes to students' capacities of creative and critical thought. Ceyhun addresses an issue that is on the minds of many college teachers: the place of liberal, even "liberating," education in an increasingly professions-oriented curriculum.

Though Professor Ceyhun's analysis and his proposals are influenced by an ideology and a revolutionist's rhetoric, it is his passion and his persistence as a college teacher that comes through most clearly in this monograph. Without these traits the contrasts among our educational philosophies and methods make little real difference.

COLLEGE TEACHING MONOGRAPHS

This series of monographs has been produced to bring attention to significant ideas and developments in college teaching. The series allows college teachers at the University of North Dakota and elsewhere to share their insights and their experiments with approaches to college level learning and instruction.

Each essay has been written to be interesting--and even helpful--to other college teachers. The authors, by putting their ideas and approaches in the public view, invite peer and citizen review. But above all these essays give acknowledgement, even celebration, to excellence in college teaching.

You are invited to contribute to this monograph series with your own essay or by encouraging colleagues to write about their teaching. The Office of Instructional development at the University of North Dakota provides editorial assistance in the preparation of each monograph. Each essay is reviewed by the editor and an editorial panel for quality of thought and experimentation and for interest to other college teachers.

We hope you enjoy this series.

Robert E. Young
Editor

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

From the beginning of this project I have received countless help and encouragements from many people: friends, colleagues, and my students who have inspired me the most. Too many people and too much time has elapsed since the conception of this work, it is impossible to thank them all. However, I must mention those whose help proved decisive at various stages of this paper, and whose far reaching influences stand out. In this respect, I would like to express my profound appreciation to Susan Koprince, Jackie Davis and Sara Hanhan who made tremendous effort to turn my style into comprehensible and readable English and to improve the structure of the essay. I owe my main debt to Bob Young, without his this project could not have occurred. The financial help and his encouragement were instrumental for the beginning of this project and its completion. I must also thank him for his comments which enriched this essay and his tremendous editing help that led immeasurable improvements. He has worked so closely with me in preparing a final copy that no one would have done. For all these, I would like to express my heartfelt thanks to him.

Finally, I must mention Paulo Freire, a Brasilian educator, who made the most profound influence on my teaching and on the development of this essay. Reading his books which were refreshing for me has altered my teaching philosophy so profoundly that I have become a new teacher, a teacher that has a special mission in democratic society. His and others' survival and future are up to what and how he discharges his responsibilities as an educator. Because of Freire's influence, it is impossible for me to say which of the thoughts expressed in this essay are his and which are my own.

No matter how much each person provides ingredients for a dish, the final product, its look and taste bears the cook's imprint, and only he alone bears the responsibility. And this is no exception. I have no reason to believe that the people mentioned above or unmentioned who have contributed to the final product are responsible for whatever errors and confusions may still remain. The responsibility is mine.

14 August 1984

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "PROBLEM-POSING" TEACHING IN A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

By
Fikret Ceyhun

INTRODUCTION

> [Humans] begin to distinguish themselves from animals as soon as they begin to produce their means of subsistence, a step which is conditioned by their physical organization. By producing their means of subsistence men are indirectly producing their actual material life.
>
> -Karl Marx, The German Ideology.

Human-beings organize themselves to satisfy their needs. And by creating a social and economic form of organization, humans become creative and critical beings. Animals also have their own social organizations, in which a certain kind of division of labor exists. They are indeed very skillful and efficient; e.g., bees making beehives or spiders building webs or traps. But they perform in the same way as their ancestors did thousands or millions of years ago. They do not create differently designed webs or new architectural beehives. Human beings have a creative capacity which enables them to design, build, and shape their environment in unique ways. It is a society's ways of teaching its young that they are responsible for extending this capacity.

The needs of a society constantly change, and in response to these changes human beings change and renew themselves. When the social organization of the past no longer satisfies peole's needs, then it is challenged with a new social order. However,

old social organizations do not easily fade away, and the process of change is usually arduously long and tortuous. Yet, throughout history people have made changes in the economic foundations of their societies and created new and more efficient structures. A succession of forms of economic organizations--slave, feudal, capitalist and socialist societies--have evolved not in a mechanical manner, but rather by critical thinking, in addition to the creativity, of people struggling to create a better society. This capacity for critical thinking is shaped also by a society's methods of education.

In general we can classify social systems as authoritarian and democratic. By authoritarian we mean a system of government that is not constitutionally accountable to the people, a system in which individual freedom is subordinated to the power of the state. People in such a system, by losing their freedom, creativity, and critical thought, are reduced to what might properly be called "automatons." If a political system does not allow the participation of everyone, equally and freely, it is not possible to change the economic and political status-quo peacefully. The education system consistent with such a political system is an authoritarian education, rather than a liberating education that promotes and cultivates a participatory political system or "democracy."

Abraham Lincoln, in his "Gettysburg Address," said "that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."[1] About ninety years before

Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson expressed his deeply felt views about human freedom and social equality. He believed that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed . . . with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." These forefathers believed that a nation cannot be free when its individuals are not free. Freedom can only be accomplished with an education that emphasizes it, an education that liberates man from his master, emancipates his beliefs and destroys despotism. Such an education, as social critic Paulo Freire says, "strives for the emergence of consciousness and critical intervention in reality" [1970: 68]. Those of us who are committed to this noble goal must reject entirely traditional education, which enslaves students and anesthetizes their minds, inhibits their creative power and suppresses their consciousness. Instead, in its place we must invoke the new liberating and humanizing pedagogy, which Freire calls "problem-posing" education.

The purpose of this essay is to show why a new teaching methodology should be accepted in the place of the old and why such a new methodology is essential for those who advocate a democratic society. Furthermore, I want to contend that the traditional system of education is not consistent with democratic principles and is alien to man's humanity.

My philosophy of teaching and education has evolved from the experience of my courses at the University of North Dakota, particularly the Principles of Economics. Over the years I have

learned a great deal from my students' reactions, from my readings in the field of pedagogy, and from the experiences of others who, like me, sensed that the prevailing methodology is deficient both in content and in the way that the content is communicated to the students. The content is full of materials that students find hard to relate to their life experiences. Students are not provided with information which concretizes their social existence in an economic world. Instead they are filled with useless and abstract principles which mythicize reality rather than explain it. This may be one reason why Joan Robinson [1979: Forward] observes, "there is a certain complacency in mainstream economic teaching which is misleading even in its homeland [and cruelly deceptive when transferred to the Third World]."

A different teaching methodology in large service courses such as Principles of Economics can generate greater interest in learning. Such a new approach can create a learning atmosphere which is more conducive to creative and critical thinking. The problem-posing approach is designed to motivate students, stimulate learning, increase participation, and make economics more relevant and worthwhile to students' lives. It also increases students' understanding of the business world and provides for real learning, instead of the book-worshipping of abstract principles removed from any real-world context, which the present traditional teaching approach emphasizes and perpetuates. Such teaching, once it becomes exciting, reinforces learning by increasing curiosity. It is now my firm belief,

after experimenting with the problem-posing methodology for five years in Principles of Economics, that such a teaching technique can be used successfully in all service courses.

My pedagogy consists of two interrelated parts--the content of the course and the way of teaching it. The subject matter of the course is unified around microeconomic problems. Students learn economics not to forget what they have learned after a final examination, but to carry the knowledge and experience with them for the rest of their lives. They learn not only how the economy functions in a political and social context, but also how microeconomic decisions are made to influence various classes of people and even oneself, unevenly. Because there is no single textbook suited to my approach, the chosen text is supplemented with readings about topics dealing with the phenomenon of the multinational corporation, corporate mergers and economic concentration, trade issues, energy and health care delivery crises, etc. These supplements describe the ordinary functioning of American capitalism.

In addition, I have a collection of articles to which students write bi-weekly "reaction" essays. These articles are written for a broad audience and are interdisciplinary in nature, dealing with current economic, political and social problems. The articles often reflect a point of view, which provokes thought and reaction, making them ideal for class discussion. The content of these materials support the problem-posing method.

PROBLEM-POSING AND TRADITIONAL PEDAGOGY

According to Freire there are two competing teaching methodologies: the traditional and the problem-posing. The first method, which Freire calls the "banking" method, is one in which (a) the teacher teaches and the students are taught; (b) the teacher knows everything and the students know nothing; (c) the teacher thinks and the students are taught about; (d) the teacher talks and the students listen meekly; (e) the teacher chooses the problem content and the students adapt to it; (f) the teacher chooses and enforces his choice and the students comply; (g) the teacher is the subject of the learning process while the students are mere objects; and (h) the teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined [Freire, 1970: 59]. The assumption that underlies this method Freire describes eloquently:

> Knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. . . . The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence. Freire [1970: 58-59]

Students reinforce this assumption by accepting this position of ignorance.

Traditional teaching alienates students and does everything possible to make them objects, unaware and unliberated. This kind of education is reactionary. It deadens rather than stimulates the students' thoughts. It takes away challenge, creativity and criticalness. It suffers from absence of doubt and impedes the students' development as complete human beings. The traditional teaching approach is not only an obstacle to learning but also to the emancipation of minds and beliefs. As Freire

succinctly states,

> the more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them. Freire [1970: 60]

Traditional teaching is also embedded with positivism,[2] an ideology which despite claims to being value free has hidden forms of domination and repression. This kind of education is deeply entrenched not only in college education but more so in elementary and secondary education. Traditional teaching is a reflection of the capitalist social order which reinforces conformity to established norms and attitudes rather than promotes critical thinking and creativity. Nelson and Nock [1978: 21, 26, 32] argue that the dominant values of the capitalist ideology, such as competition, elitism, pragmatism, authoritarianism, corporatism, and materialism are an integral part of the traditional method of teaching. Theory and practice, thinking and doing are divorced from each other. This makes it easier for a dominant elite to control and perpetuate the current social order through the schooling process.

The opposite of the banking method is the relatively new and revolutionary problem-posing methodology which humanistically focuses on the student and liberates his mind from a constricted teaching environment. From the outset this method establishes dialogue between the teacher and students without presenting one as the opposite or superior of the other. It stimulates critical

thinking and develops the quest for mutual humanization. In this process the teacher becomes a partner of the students. The oppositeness of teacher and students ceases to exist, and in its place a new relationship emerges: Teachers are no longer merely the ones who teach, but the ones who are themselves taught by the students.

As problem-posing teaching contends, education must not mythicize reality but rather unveil the world to the student as it is, with all its pleasant and unpleasant aspects. It must encourage the student to meet with people who hold different views and teach them to listen to and enter into dialogue with others. Education must also foster tolerance, understanding, and mutual respect. Cultivating such an atmosphere creates respectful coexistence of different views and competing ideas. A society of these kinds of individuals with different opinions is not only more democratic but more dynamic as well.

Cultivating such a democratic and dynamic environment within educational institutions is not an easy job, however, because schools are not divorced from their socio-economic environments. These environments, and therefore educational institutions, are controlled by a ruling elite whose interest is to promote certain ideas and conformity to them. Naturally this makes it difficult to adopt an alternative teaching method. Nevertheless, alternative teaching can be created.

Any alternative method must begin by not taking anything for granted. It must develop critical self-consciousness by teaching

students to question everything and to accept something only after thorough analysis and synthesis of their own. Critical self-awareness can contribute to the examination of our assumed suppositions and facts; and it can show us that there are alternative conceptions of ordering the world, alternative perspectives and alternative conclusions which may seem to be more logical and meaningful to our own lives.

As Madan Sarup observes, this is not an easy task for a teacher. "It was teachers who, through a change of their classroom practices, were to be the motor of educational change. They could hardly do this by themselves. Fundamentally, what was lacking was the realization that the struggle to liberate education and the struggle to democratize economic life are inextricably linked" Sarup [1978: 107]. But the alternative to this kind of revolutionary teaching is the present teaching approach which stifles and deadens both teacher and student. Hence, the revolutionary teacher who believes in democratic principles and in a democratized egalitarian society must keep trying fearlessly.

Many students in college who receive traditional education feel that they cannot learn. This sense of inferiority is cultivated by traditional teaching methods in an authoritarian atmosphere of our schools--from kindergarten through college. Once we remove this feeling of inferiority and remind students that we are all equally naive about the world, then we can begin learning by untangling the complex pieces of reality one by one.

This theme must be emphasized constantly to students. Small statements like, "no prior knowledge in economics is required," and "everyone should feel free to ask any troublesome question, no matter how foolish the question may seem to be," eliminate the fear and the barrier between the instructor and students. When students' minds are emancipated they become critical, and critical thinking is just the beginning of the quest for learning.

With the problem-posing method, learning becomes a rewarding experience for students. Georg Hegel (in The Phenomenology of Mind) proposed that if a student, because of the ways he has been taught, "has not attained . . . an independent self-consciousness"[3] then he cannot be recognized as a person. An oppressed self cannot be in command of himself, but rather is reduced to an object. Once man achieves his consciousness, he then begins to perceive social, political and economic contradictions in his society and takes action against the oppressive environment which kept him in the dark. James F. Becker suggests: "It is not the oppressors--who never learn--but the oppressed who, in discovering their oppression, discover themselves."[4] The conscious man develops a different perception of reality and tries to deal with it rather than surrender to it. His eyes are no longer blind. His mind is open and his beliefs are emancipated.

John Kenneth Galbraith (1973), the eminent economist, has observed that the present pedogogy in economics has been overt persuasion, for which educators are responsible. For Galbraith

it is "the responsibility of university teachers to see that [their] education is not social conditioning" [1973: 227] but rather the creation of critical thinkers. He feels that

> the emancipation of belief requires presumption against all persuasion . . . Such persuasion exists to impose the goals of the [corporate] technostructure on the individual. The individual who wishes to be free cannot, therefore, accede. He must resist. [1973: 227]

Problem-posing teaching does exactly what Galbraith suggests. It provides a humanistic education, deepens the consciousness of students, and liberates their minds. When this happens, students deal critically and creatively with reality and participate in the transformation of their world rather than conforming to it. As Richard Shaull says in his "Foreword" to Freire's book [1970: 15], this kind of liberating education "could . . . contribute to the formation of a new man and mark the beginning of a new era in Western history."

Students in the traditional method of instruction and learning cannot comprehend reality when they are introduced to only one facet of a multi-faceted problem or to one world view which fails to grasp the complexity of socio-economic problems. We can only understand problems if our perspective is broad and historical in method. Banking education focuses on problems in isolation, devoid of historical, political, social and moral context. As Robert L. Heilbroner and Aaron Singer [1977: 2] argue, today's life and its intricacies cannot be properly understood without examining the historical evolution of American society. Heilbroner and Singer correctly contend that "it is the

property of the thesa of economic transformation that it touches on so many others. In fact . . . without comprehension of the American economic transformation many other histories of American life remain unintelligible" (1977: 2). The present moment is a continuation of the past which also charts future alternatives. Such a method of analysis remains outside of banking teaching. To elaborate these ideas and to further contrast the two systems of education I offer some examples.

EXAMPLES OF PROBLEM-POSING TEACHING

It would be impossible for students of banking education to understand why suddenly the country is experiencing a conglomeration of businesses. It may look like a cyclical phenomenon which occurs exogenously to the present rather than being influenced by present politics. And the politics, in turn, are influenced by economics that has been generating the upsurge in merger movements. Traditional teaching is unable to penetrate into the root causes of many economic events. Furthermore, traditional teaching is not interested in discovering the root causes of economic phenomena which remain outside of economics.

Teachers utilizing the traditional technique, for instance, emphasize the irrelevance of politics in economics when in fact it is otherwise. Consider the following from Norman C. Miller's article in The Wall Street Journal (August 20, 1981).

> The merger mania that is producing gigantic corporations has disturbing political implications as well as strictly economic consequences. . . . The mega-mergers are developing at a time when big business is moving more aggressively into politics. . . . Big business leaders such as Irwing Shapiro

> of Du Pont, Reginald Jones of General Electric and Clifton Garvin of Exxon understand and play power politics, both domestically and internationally, as well as anyone. They have welded the Business Roundtable, representing the nation's top corporations, into one of the most powerful lobbying forces in Washington. If anyone doubts their clout, take another look at the tax bill Congress just passed, which includes more tax breaks for business than anyone would have thought imaginable just a couple of years ago . . . In 1980, business PACs gave $35 million to congressional . . . power brokers in both parties.

And U.S. News & World Report (December 11, 1978) reports:

> If you're waiting for comprehensive national health insurance, don't hold your breath. Carter's idea now is to submit it to Congress in pieces, slowly. First sections are due on Capitol Hill next spring--including coverage for catastrophic accidents or illnesses, expanded health aid for the poor. The big plan supported by Senator Kennedy of Massachusetts and labor unions will get a hearing, but opponents seem to have the votes. Physicians helped 20 Senate candidates this year with $5,000 or more each. Nineteen won.5

This attempt by big business and professions to influence the government is not readily understandable to the average American, or to students of traditional teaching whose sources of information outside the text come not from diverse but from very concentrated business sources.[6]

The awesome power of mega-corporations and professional associations must be troubling to all critical thinkers. Corporations, like AT&T, Exxon, Mobil, GM, IT&T, IBM, GE, etc. all have revenues exceeding the total GNPs of over 100 nations. Even the oil-rich OPEC nations individually cannot come close to Exxon's $104 billion revenues in 1980. GM employs a number of people which exceeds the population of some states in the union. AT&T's $6.4 billion profits exceed the total budgets of several

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

states combined. The executives of these giant corporations, living thousands of miles away, influence people's economic lives and their political choices. The private interests of these corporations and these professions are not necessarily in harmony with the public interest, as Norman Miller [August 20, 1981] observes:

> The development of mega-corporations with immense political clout--and an increasing willingness to use it [ever more skillfully]--is fraught with danger for the nation's political system. For the profit imperative that drives the managers of the mega-corporations doesn't necessarily coincide with the national interest. . . . And whatever the economic consequences of the mega-merger trend, the concentration of increasing political power in the hands of remote corporate chieftains is a worrisome development in a democracy. (Emphasis added)

These kinds of issues must be discussed in an uninhibited atmosphere and they must be critically examined. When I entertained a discussion in my class on the Miller article, one student, being a product of banking education, dismissed it as an important issue by saying that business always influenced the government of this country and the system is still a good one. That is the response of an automaton generated by the banking education. A society of automatons cannot be dynamic and heterogenous, for its members allow themselves to be controlled like magnets which gravitate toward a power pole. A society of automatons suffers from absence of doubt and questioning, and therefore is doomed to stagnate.

Discussion of an article like Miller's in a class is a good example of problem-posing education. To understand the decisions

firms make and how these decisions are made, it is essential to comprehend the evolution of the firm along with the transformation of American economy. In order to understand the significance of the issues in Miller's article and to put those issues in a better perspective, I briefly explain in the class the history of merger movements since the time of the Civil War Reconstruction to 1980. Then I introduce to the class for discussion the economic consequences and political implications of this corporate evolution. Miller's article serves the purpose well.

As a problem-posing educator I cannot expect students to comprehend a complex subject without posing thought-provoking questions. These kinds of questions force them to think and react. The reaction of one student will create chain-reactions in the minds of the rest of the students. Once this is achieved, we have started to think critically. If I were to follow the path of a banking educator, I would issue "communiques" consisting of doses of monetary and fiscal policies to solve the problems of unemployment and inflation caused when the corporations shuffle jobs from one place to another (or from one country to another), or create over 12 million turnovers (shuffling people from one job to another). When economic concentration continues, it creates concentration of wealth and power in the hands of fewer and fewer people. As it does this, it naturally creates poverty as the opposite of wealth. They are two sides of the same coin. We cannot begin to understand such problems by issuing decrees which focus on a tiny portion of a

much bigger problem. The banking system of education--with its ties to the military industrial complex and the multinational corporations--cannot unveil and understand President Reagan's new budget proposal. For instance Miller, in his [February 8, 1982] article, observes that,

> those of us are reasonably affluent can afford to be fairly relaxed [and unconcerned] about President Reagan's dangerously unbalanced budget . . . [because] we get our income taxes cut 10% this year and next, plus inflation--indexed cuts forever. The wealthiest among us get their rates cut to 50% from 70%. We get a sizable cut in our capital gains taxes. We can shelter substantial sums in IRAs and Keoghs and get big annual tax deductions to boot. We can invest in tax-free 'All-Savers' certificates paying premium interest rates. If we have stock options, we'll get all our immediate gains free of tax when we exercise our new 'incentive' options.

What about the needy who are the opposite of the rich? Miller says:

> the needy among us will not be all right. They will suffer--and suffer badly--even if, as the President promises, supply side economics eventually produces sound economic growth. For until the supply-side miracle occurs, if it ever does, the President's harsh social-program cuts will impose more pain and sacrifice on the poorest members of society--while the rest of us enjoy a bonanza of immediate benefits . . . The poor will suffer under the new Reagan budget, remembering that social programs were cut $35 billion last year. The new budget envisions $26 billion of additional cuts in direct aid for the needy, more indirect reductions and further cuts in the year ahead.

To understand the budget, let us briefly focus on the Members of Congress. Miller says that they got

> the most dazzling tax bonanza of all under a law sneaked through the last day of the 1981 congressional session. They can claim annual tax deductions of $18,000 or more for their Washington living expenses! With other standard tax breaks, some of our lawmakers could wind up owing almost no taxes on their $60,662 salaries.

We read these kinds of stories in medieval history, where those who owned the land (the landed aristocracy) had not only economic but political power as well; they used their political power to perpetuate their economic power. These kinds of power are not separate and independent of one another, as banking education teaches, but are mutually interdependent. Their effect on each other can never be conceived when they are studied in isolation, as the banking system utterly advocates. Why and how such a budget was proposed and legislated into law can be understood only in problem-posing teaching where we pause to think and debate. Issues like these fall outside the realm of the traditional teaching method. Students who come out of problem-posing education understand the problems, are concerned with them, and search for solutions, solutions that better not only their lives, but the lives of future generations as well. On the other hand, students who come from banking education are unable to recognize the problems' existence and therefore cannot search for solutions. They can easily adapt to the world they live in without being aware of its imperfections and without worrying about solutions.

Finally, a "guns and butter" example, an issue raised by Miller [February 8, 1982] in an article on the process of budget decisions. He says,

> it is fundamentally unfair for the administration to concentrate almost exclusively on cutting assistance to the poor while simultaneously providing an excessive array of tax breaks . . . to affluent persons and corporations. The imbalance of the administration's policies becomes more drastic when one examines its

> incredibly overstuffed military budget . . . Under the Reagan plan, Pentagon spending will zoom up 18% to $216 billion next year. Just about every weapon the Pentagon ever conceived--some of highly questionable military value--will be purchased at a sharply accelerated rate.

This debate was conducted at the University of North Dakota during the peace conference in April 1982. I was ecstatic about our university president's call for a peace conference to discuss these issues, for it would provide inquiry into the unsatiated weapons build-up in a form of dialogue which the problem-posing method of education advocates. In this debate, we were discussing the alternative uses of the nations' scarce resources. More weapon production means less civilian goods production. Does an economic sacrifice justify the increased military production? Can we define national security in military terms? Should the definition of national security give more emphasis to economic security? How much do we have to tighten our belts and postpone our desires so that we can militarily advance? Are there severe adverse consequences of militarization of the society? Who will make these decisions? These are questions which can be posed in problem-posing teaching for discussion.

In problem-posing education we can no longer accept statements like, "the public interest is served automatically when private interests are served." We must scrutinize such statements to determine how and why the public interest is served. The problem-posing education neither accepts these kinds of statements nor rejects them automatically. It encourages neither agreements nor disagreements. It poses the question for

discussion and focuses the debate on the kinds of questions raised in these examples.

All along I have been arguing that these issues and questions are very important for a democratic society and for the problem-posing education too. They ought to be discussed by the public and more so by students and teachers in universities. These questions reflect certain values which should not be side-stepped, but should be the center of the focus of the debate. We are not here to certify automatons with B.A., M.A., or Ph.D. degrees, so that they can carry out orders and directives without thinking, questioning, and comprehending those orders, but to cultivate human values in students and make them both more human and at the same time humane.

RESULTS OF PROBLEM-POSING EDUCATION

I am an optimist who has hope for a better future and a more peaceful world without famine and misery. It is such optimistic hope that gives me courage to struggle and strive for a better and more critical education. My optimism gives me the incentive to search for better teaching methods in my class. My search gives me enormous inner satisfaction, especially as I get positive feedback from my students.

I have adopted a problem-posing method in my teaching because I am convinced through my own experience that it is not possible through use of traditional teaching techniques to develop the creative and critical individuals that a democratic society deems necessary for its survival. It is improbable that

we can make our students free, active, and responsible through traditional teaching methods which do not further inquiry, interest in the subject, and the emancipation of beliefs. Furthermore, the content of traditional education, consistent with its methodology, does not further one's knowledge and understanding of the social environment. To make problem-posing pedagogy successful, the content of teaching material must not mythicize the world, but teach it the way it is with all its imperfections. To do this, I have chosen course content that is compatible with my pedagogy (see Appendix A).

I state my philosophy of teaching in my course syllabus, making it clear to students at the very beginning of the instruction. It may be summarized as follows:

> When a student enters the university, he becomes a member of a community of scholars, the same community to which the instructor belongs. Both of them have the priviledge to work within this scholarly community and both of them have the obligation to contribute to its success. Maximum learning, and hence maximum success, will be attained in an environment where the teacher sees his own knowledge as a thrust for the students, sees the learning process as mutual experience, and encourges self-discipline and serious hard work by his own example. Students are strongly encouraged to criticize the ideas, principles, facts, and even the teaching process itself; without constructive criticism from the students, we are all blind to those faults and shortcomings within ourselves which retard the advancement of our knowledge and understanding.
>
> Economics, as I teach it, encourages critical thinking and stimulates thought. Economics is presented as a social science which is heavily laden with social, political and moral values, rather than an exact science with universal principles like physics or chemistry. Students should not view economics as teaching them universal principles which are true for all times and places. They should read their books critically, they should view the statements made by economists critically, and

they should consider the teacher's explanations as opinions rather than absolute principles.

By explaining this philosophy in the course syllabus, I have been able to stem potential teacher-student antagonism, by reconciling the poles of contradiction between teacher and learner. This cannot be done in the traditional approach, which negates education, i.e., the process of inquiry and learning.

One of the revolutionary aspects of my teaching is reaction essays which the students write bi-weekly and which are graded by the student assistant. The students' reactions are discussed in the class period in which I collect them. The essays are written as a reaction to articles, like those excerpted above. About 100 articles, grouped in eight categories, deal with current socio-economic problems. Articles which are written from a specific point of view serve best for discussion. They stimulate thought and creative thinking on current problems which directly or indirectly influece students' lives.

A second feature of my pedagogy is essay exams. In the essay questions the students are not asked to reproduce what they read (or learned), but rather to apply it. I ask why and how such and such works or does not work. Or they may be given a statement or quotation on which to comment, e.g., Do you agree? Why (or why not)? How does it apply to problems today or to your own life? Does it make . . . better and how? If it worked then, does it now? In what manner is what you have learned meaningful and helpful to you and why?

The purpose of both the reaction essays and the examinations, is to teach students to think critically, and to enable them to think formally and increase their writing ability. All of this requires a lot of time devoted to grading and preparing the class presentations from various materials for lecture and discussion. This method of "labor-intensive" teaching requires more time than the traditional method of teaching. The traditional teacher has a textbook which provides a fixed and predetermined course content and exam questions. The teacher recites the contents in the lecture and the students take notes and memorize them in order to reproduce them on multiple-choice exam questions which are sent to the computer for scoring. My method requires more sacrifice from the instructor. Also, teaching large sections of 150 students requires an additional help from a student assistant. The student assistant reads reaction essays and comments.

With the problem-posing approach I have been accomplishing more and more of my goals every semester. My teaching is increasingly challenging, exciting, creative and enjoyable, which makes the very process of learning in my classes a humanizing and maturing experience, not only for the students but for myself as well. No longer is teaching a boring and alienating experience, but one which is mutually beneficial and gratifying. I am challenged more and more by my students, which furthers my inquiry into the issues and the very process of teaching. This endeavor, in turn, presents more challenge to students, who are continuously motivated to learn. We (students and myself) view

ourselves as unfinished and incomplete historical beings in the class. This mutual awareness of our incompleteness gives us added reasons to strive to be better and more complete, and encourages us to strive for further learning. As Freire says, "in this incompletion and this awareness lie the very roots of education as an exclusively human manifestation. The unfinished character of men and the transformational character of reality necessitate that education be an ongoing ativity" [1970: 73].

People educated in this way not only transform themselves but the world around them. Hence this kind of education, in Freire's words,

> affirms men as beings who transcend themselves, who move forward and look ahead, for whom immobility represents a fatal threat, for whom looking at the past must only be a means of understanding more clearly what and who they are so that they can more wisely build the future. . . . A deepened consciousness of their situation leads men to apprehend that situation as an historical reality susceptible of transformation. . . . If men, as historical beings necessarily engaged with other men in a movement of inquiry, did not control that movement, it would be (and is) a violation of men's humanity. Freire [1970: 72-73]

This is my goal in my classroom, reflected in both the content and method of teaching. Both the method and the content are continuously revised and updated to pose challenging and creative quesitons. Students provide constant feedback and are my co-partners. As I have increasingly discovered, such a pursuit cannot be carried out in isolation from the students but only in solidarity with them.

During the last four years I have sensed my students' pleasure in taking this course; they have expressed that it was a

rewarding and stimulating learning experience for them. A few have come personally to tell of their satisfaction and encouraged me to continue this way of teaching. Several others have written letters of appreciation.[7] I had never had this kind of student reaction when I was diligently teaching in the traditional manner. For whatever they indicate, the student evalution scores improved as well.

I have also seen students growing in the class by writing better essays, discussing questions more intelligently and expressing their thoughts more coherently. Many students who have negative perceptions at the beginning of the semester change their attitudes 180 degrees by the end. Many have explained to me later that they were afraid of speaking, of making naive comments, and of being ridiculed by their peers. This kind of fear, which is a product of the banking method, is eventually overcome by almost all students. As a teacher, I find no greater reward than seeing my pupils growing, developing, and becoming fully human.

UNIVERSITY EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

University education has particularly special importance in democratic society. What is university education? This is a philosophical question, and its answer eludes many educators. The scholars and philosophers who were invited to UND's centennial celebration in February, 1983, debated this question without reaching a consensus. The conception of a "university" raises a sharp distinction between teachers who want

to preserve the present system of banking education and teachers who want to humanize and make it, in Freire's words, "revolutionary futurity."

University is defined as "an educational institution for superior instruction . . . [with] a general tendency to restrict the word to institutions offering non-professional instruction."[8] For example, in professional instruction one would teach students how to follow a car mechanics manual to fix a car or to prepare soup from a recipe. Non-vocational instruction is not that which teaches one to follow certain pre-determined instructions, but to teach and create such manuals or designs. It is instruction for creative thinking, instruction that is capable of creating alternatives for conditions which may arise not only today but in the future as well. I have argued above that the new methodology is non-professional or non-vocational instruction. Since problem-posing education posites itself as one which attempts to overcome dehumanization and to create a qualitatively new instuction that gives hope to both students and teachers, it must be our chief mission in the university to promote such a methodology of teaching.

Early I exposed the contradictions between a democracy, which can only flourish in an environment made up of individuals who are critical thinkers and who choose dialogue rather than submission, and a society of automatons who are most suited to an environment which cherishes authoritarianism. We cannot choose the authoritarian banking system of education in this institution

of higher learning. A careful examination of the student-teacher relationship at the University of North Dakota, both inside and outside the classroom, reveals a fundamental characteristic well-described in banking education: the teacher is the subject, and the students are the listening objects. The objects are plugged into their chairs, recording the teacher's lecture like a taping instrument. This is a lifeless and petrified system, particularly in lower level service courses.

This is a system in crisis. Students are filled with meaningless information detached from reality. The misconprehension of socio-economic phenomena inherent in the banking methodology leads students to be increasingly less critical and progressively alienated. All those words of the teacher which are supposed to give life a meaning of joy and vividness, instead become hollow and verbose. This was well-illustrated in my own graduate education. One of my teachers, explaining a neo-classical growth model, said in response to a question: "I don't care whether the real world conforms to the model or not. I am just concerned with the model's mathematical properties and lending itself to geometrical expositions for instruction. . . ."

If our mission is to further critical thinking, and if critical thinking is conducive to democracy and a dynamic society, we cannot adopt the banking technique as the mode of teaching at UND. To do that does great injustice to the society which entrusted us to educate creative men who dare to tackle problems without fear of losing prestige or position. Society

expects this from us and we owe it to our students. We have to establish conditions that are conducive to the formation of authentic thought and action, in which the students are increasingly posed with challenging problems. If they are confronted with problems relating to themselves in the world and if they are taught critically, then they will be able to develop their critical power to perceive the real world. They will no longer see the world as static but in the process of transformation.

Banking education, which creates a credulous and servile man who has no place in a democratic society, certainly has no place in a university where critical inquiry into human progress takes place. We cannot use a teaching pedagogy that fosters despotism, but need one that destroys it. We must opt for a pedagogy that restores dignity and humanity to man. An education generated by such a pedagogy cannot help but be an exhilaratingly liberating experience.

In a university, students cannot be free if education fosters authoritarianism, servility, and conformity. In this respect, the relationship between student and professor is not much different than that between the slave and his master, or the serf and his lord. Freire brings this into sharp focus with his description of the relationship between landless peasants in underdeveloped countries and their landlord. "The peasants feel inferior to the boss because the boss seems to be the only one who knows things and is able to run things" [1970: 49]. In our

traditional system of education, students regard themselves as ignorant and the professor as one who knows everything under the sun. By this, I do not imply that students should not listen to the professor; on the contrary, they should think of themselves as co-investigators in dialogue with the professor. The professor can present the materials to them for their critical considerations. In doing this, the professor constantly reconsiders his earlier teaching as the students critique his materials. This is the role of problem-posing teaching and this ought to be the role of university education in a democratic society. Under this kind of education a fascinating learning experience occurs, and such experience aids in the development of critical minds.

University education, by adopting the problem-posing methodology, will promote free, critical thinking and the liberation of minds. It will eliminate superiority/inferiority or oppressor/oppressed relationships among the participants in the learning process. In this effort, neither the students nor the teacher can achieve their liberation individually. It must be a collective endeavor between the students and the teacher. This is a humanizing learning process which also increases the awareness of the students and their responsibility. As Eric Fromm, The Heart of Man, says, the students must realize that they are fighting for "freedom to create and to construct, to wonder and to venture. Such freedom [also] requires that the individual be active and responsible, not a slave or a well-fed cog in the machine."[9]

Banking education or traditional education leads the students to mechanical and meaningless memorization without awakening their consciousness and without ever making them understand the significance of their memorized materials. The students become lifeless objects with a memory capacity to record and replay. The teacher, instead of engaging into dialogue with his pupils, issue directives to be remembered in the test. In this sense, our traditional education is one which creates two automatons: one is the teacher who is the depositor and the other is the student who is the depository.

Authoritarian education cultivates a totalitarian political system in which power and control lie in a knowledgeable and wealthy elite whom the economic structure and political organization are devised to serve. The totalitarian political system is the enemy of man's freedom. A human-being cannot achieve his liberation and his full potential in a system that stifles all critical voices and oppresses its individuals. When individuals are slaves in oppressive society, then they cannot perform one of their critical duties: They can no longer be the motor of change in the society. A society like this inevitably stagnates, falls into feudal relationships, and degenerates into corruption, poverty, and the abuse of man's humanity.

Authoritarian education is in conflict with the basic premises of democratic society, a society that encourages freedom, diverse thoughts and non-conformism. Authoritarian education violates man's inalienable rights, the rights that were

etched in the Bill of Rights in the constituion. Only the liberating education that I have labored to explain is compatible with democracy. Problem-posing education is a choice of ours and a choice of democratic society. Only such education furthers man's humanity. By emancipating his belief, the problem-posing pedagogy encourages critical inquiry and creativity. Critical and creative inquiry, which can flourish only in democratic society, are sorely needed for human progress.

The problem-posing education that I have been advocating contributes to the transformation of man and creates a new human being who creates a new society. A new man, being a product of a new environment, critically engages its change dialectically. This marks a new epoch in the history of mankind.

NOTES

1. Percival Chubb, ed. Selections from Lincoln's Addresses. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1922, p. 175.

2. Postivism is an approach by which a phenomenon can be investigated devoid of political and social implications especially in an educational setting. By employing mathematical and/or statistical tools the phenomena are quantified, interpretation of the quantified variables are done in a neutral and value-free context. In this sense positivism, therefore, is a historical method.

3. Quoted in Freire (1970: 20).

4. James F. Baker, Marxian Political Economy.

5. Powerful AMA, with their large war chest of money, blocked with the passage in Congress of a comprehensive health care system for so long that the U.S. and South Africa are the only two countries among the 61 industrialized nations without nationalized health care. The powerful medical industrial complex managed to defeat a proposal on the 1978 election ballot to put a lid on rising medical costs in North Dakota.

6. As Smith (Sept. 6, 1980) and Ebert-Miner (February 10, 1982) show that the flow of news, outside the socialist block, is controlled by the "big four." The Associated Press, United Press International, Reuters and Agence-France Presse "belong to three nations but supply 90 percent of all of the international news that passes into the newsrooms of the entire globe." Among the "big four", AP alone has a lion's share, controlling more than fifty percent of the world's news market. The oligopoly control of the information and their domination in information poses great danger to the culture and political systems of the receiving countries. By monopolizing the collection and determining the dissemination of the news they pose the greatest danger to a democratic political system. The news is produced and distributed for profit. The self-interest of these corporations is in conflict with public interest, democracy, and free and critical thinking. By that control, they create absence of diversity and mold over values and social morals according to their private interests. The situation is especially bad for the third world nations, which represent two-thirds of humanity but control only 10% of the total news they receive. With the decision to collect, edit and distribute the news these companies have enormous power to determine what we should know and should not know. As Ebert-Miner says, the "big four" transmit more than 90% of the news to the third world peoples with no flow in the opposite direction. The importance of this phenomenon cannot be ignored without pausing for a moment and thinking of the consequences.

7. Addressing a letter to the department chairman one student said, "I found this class [Principles of Economics] the most intellectually provocative one that I have had in 5 years of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

college work, i.e., 4 years of undergraduate and 1 year of post-graduate work. I thoroughly enjoyed it. I found my thinking challenged in a way that I had not experienced before in the typical 100% lecture-notes-test type of format. Having approximately 7 years of professional work experience to draw upon, I found that this was a class that was very applicable to the real world. I found that I can now take these principals and apply them to what is happening now in our economy and that ability makes me feel more informed and somewhat more prepared to question present day theories."

I have received a 4-1/2 page type-writtien letter from one of my Economics 102 students. I will quote part of the letter as it is.

> Once there was a man who one night found his friend searching under a lamplight post for his keys. He asked his friend why he continued his futile search there when his keys obviously weren't anywhere near. His friend replied "Oh well, I know that I lost them farther down the road, but the light is so much better here."
>
> In the same way, I think our society is guilty of looking for solutions to our economic and social ills only where the lighting is better.
>
> At the beginning of this course, we were asked to state our objectives of this course. Very honestly, I came into this class only expecting to learn a few basic economic principles. But for me, the course has gone far beyond that, thanks to humanistics and humble attitudes of the instructors. They don't claim to know all the answers, but at least they appear to be looking for problems and solutions where they really are and not only where "the light is better." Most professors and other instructors, from my experiences, will pay lip service to humanistic values, but will then turn around and continue to perpetuate the existing system, both by their eduational methods and by their personal views.
>
> I find that not only has this course been very interesting, but more important, it has been a true learning experience in that it has offered, through readings and difficult questions concerning values, an opportunity to think and re-evaluate values and life-styles. It is responsible education because it gives the students the option of trying to use their education, skills, and talents for the benefit or destruction of this planet and its life, including other human beings.
>
> For me, it has reaffirmed a decision I made a long time ago to try to work to better this world, and in so doing, incidentally better myself. Moreover, I believe that this course has laid a foundation of basic economic

and social knowledge and awareness that will spur me to continue to learn more as I continue in life. I believe this interest will cause me to make more responsible decisions that concern me, and my interactions with others in society. That is what I came to college for.

I believe that a course that is presented in this manner takes a great deal of courage from the instructors involved because it exposes them to ridicule in many cases, and in some systems, even the threat of loss of a position. Because I'm aware of this, I'm very grateful for having the opportunity to be in this class. I also wish that there were more instructors like you. If there were, there would be more true education and less indoctrination. I hope you don't ever change your teaching methods even though it means more work for you.

I will end with a quote from yet another student who sheds light on a different question.

Although we conflict on a number of things--such as the proper role of philosophy, the importance of "conversion" as opposed to argumentation, and the nature of a proper academic effort--you have nevertheless been a great source of inspiration for me in my difficult moments in Grand Forks. Ever since you first allowed Michael Thomas and me, as youthful, brash freshmen, to take you to Bonanza and to write our versions of the Final Exam., I have been impressed with the concern you demonstrate for your fellow man. And it does not seem to matter if the fellow man in question is an innocent peasant in El Salvador or a struggling freshman at UND; are very consistent on this.

8. Funk and Wagnalls New Standard Dictionary of the English Language

9. Quoted in Freire (1970: 55).

REFERENCES

1. Louis Althusser 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." In Lenin and Philosophy. New York: Monthly Review Press.

2. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis 1980. School in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

3. "Campus Cartels" 1982. Editorial in The Nation, March 20.

4. Percival Chubb, editor 1922. Selection from Lincoln's Addresses, New York: The MacMillan Company.

5. Allan Ebert-Miner 1982. "Third World Challenges New Monopolies." Guardian, February 10.

6. John L. Elias 1976. Conscientization and Deschooling. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press..ps

7. Ben Fine 1981. Economic Theory and Ideology. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.

8. Paulo Freire 1970. Pedagogy of the Oppressedd. Translated by Myra Bergman Ramos, with Forward by Richard Shaull. New York: The Seabury Press.

9. ----- 1973. Education for Critical Consciousness. New York: The Seabury Press.

10. John Kenneth Galbraith 1973. Economics and the Public Purpose. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

11. Robert L. Heilbroner 1968. The Making of Economic Society. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

12. ----- 1974. An Inquiry into the Human Prospect. New York: W.W. Norton and company.

13. ----- and Aaron Singer 1977. The Transformation of America. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

14. Joseph P. Hughes 1981. "Methodological Confusion in Introductory Economics." The American Economist, Vol. 25, No. 2 (Fall), pp. 7-11.

15. John Marsmtell 1982. "Teaching the Economics and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844: Human Centered Economics." Review of Radical Political Economics, Vol. 13, No. 4 (Winter), pp. 53-62.

16. Norman C. Miller 1981. "The Political Danger of New Mega-Corporations." The Wall Street Journal, August 20.

17. ----- 1982. "Reagan's Version of Guns-and-Butter Policy." The Wall Street Journal, February 4.

18. ----- 1982. "Flunking the Fairness Test." The Wall Street Journal, February 8.

19. Randle W. Nelsen and David A. Nock, editors 1978. Reading, Writing, and Riches: Education and the Socio-Economic Order in North America. Toronto, Ontario: Between the Lines.

20. David F. Noble 1982. "The Selling of the University." The Nation, February 6.

21. ----- and Nancy E. Pfund 1980. "The Plastic Tower: Business Goes Back to College." The Nation, September 20.

22. Madan Sarup 1978. Marxism and Education. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Press..pa

23. Ira Shor 1980. Critical Teaching and Everyday Life. Boston: South End Press.

24. Anthony Smith 1980. "The Global Data Bank: Information--The Newest Resource." The Nation, September 6.

25. David N. Smith 1974. Who Rules the Universities. New York: Monthly Review Press.

26. John Siegfried and Rendigs Fels 1979. 'Research on Teaching College Economics: A Survey." Journal of Economic Literature, Vol. 17, No. 3 (September), pp. 923-69.

27. "Special Report: The Speedup in Automation." Business Week, August 3, 1981.

28. George Stigler 1963. "Elementary Economics Education." American Economic Review, Vol. 53, No. 2 (May), pp. 653-59.

APPENDIX A

PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMICS: ECONOMICS AS IF PEOPLE MATTERED

1983/1984

INSTRUCTOR: FIKRET CEYHUN

OFFICE: GAMBLE HALL - ROOM 290 I
OFFICE HOURS: MWF 10-11:00 AND BY APPOINTMENT
TELEPHONE: 777-3348

OBJECTIVE OF THE COURSE:

Our primary goal in this course is to study the American economy, its function in today's world, and the decision-making processes and their consequences in households, business, and government. Since this is a course on the American economy we try to understand what decisions are made, who is making them, and why, and what the real life effect of these decisions is upon us. From this point of view, this course is devoted to explaining how the economy works (or does not work) and why it does (or does not).

Economics deals with problems that involve human well-being, especially material well-being. Almost every problem that concerns human welfare is directly or indirectly related to economics; consequently, many problems fall into the domain of economics. Economics is not merely a body of technical terms or principles whose applications are confined to the question of efficiency. Economics is not a science whose principles have universal applications nor is it a value-free science. Rather economics is a discipline whose principles have universal applications nor is it a value-free science. Rather economics is a discipline whose principles are heavily laden with social, political and moral values. Therefore, this course is not a course in abstract principles but rather it is a course which tackles very real and urgent problems that touch every one of us. Some of the issues that will be studied in this course have a direct and immediate bearings on orur lives; others will affect our future and our children's future. Economics is one of the bodies of social knowledge which seek to understand and explain our societal problems and then to solve those problems.

Economics, as I teach it, encourages critical thinking and stimulates thought. Economics is presented as a social science which is heavily laden with social, political and moral values, rather than an exact science with universal principles like physics or chemistry. Laws of physics have univeriaal applicability across our planet under all social systems; economics, on the other hand, is a social science whose principles lack global applicability. Economic principles are not timeless. Nevertheless, economics, like all other sciences, uses scientific methodology. By scientific methodology, we mean that the economist observes society and from such observation

draws theoretical abstractions. An Economist forms a logical model which has testable, logical conclusions, then, confronts these logical conclusions with observed facts. Thus the model is either confirmed, rejected or modified. But societies are not constant, but rather dynamic and continually changing, because human beings are constantly changing, forcing economic and social institutions to change over time. When old institutions do not respond to changes in human needs, people form different organizations. For instance, modern Keynesian economics as developed by Western economists since Great Depression, has been contradicted not only by the economies of underdeveloped countries but also by the economies of developed countries in the 1980's. The principles of Keynesian economics could not be applied to the Third World nations because such countries have situations unique unto themselves. The belief that employment and income could be stimulated through the multiplier effect and the belief that balance of payments deficits could be cured by devaluation are but two good examples. Hence a theory, which might have been relevant yesterday, is not necessarily valid today. Similarly, an economic principles which may be relevant to one country is not necessarily valid to all countries.

When economic, political, and social institutions change, a new theory usually emerges to challenge old theories of exlpanation. When the old theory is contradicted by new facts, it does not mean that the old theory will fade away and open the door for the new theory. Some theorists will still hold to the old theory. Sometimes several new explanations emerge to challenge the old. Therefcre, economists disagree over explanation of economic phenomena, and economics is a controversial subject whose controversy rests on honest differences among social scientists.

Hence, you should not view this course as teaching you universal principles which are true for all time and place. You should read your books critically, you should view the statements made by economists critically, and you should consider my explanations as just a view rather than absolute principles. You must always recognize theoretical explanation as but one view and remember that there are other views which may be equally relevant; but you must only accept (or choose) a theoretical stance after conducting your own critical evaluation to the point where a particular explanation becomes reasonable and logically meaningful to you.

To understand our complex society, we will be utilizing principles of economic science to analyze factual data; our analysis will have two primary goals. The first is to use economic theoretical principles to organize facts into meaningful causal relationships. The second is to test the data against the theories. Our understanding of the American economy will grow rapidly when we discuss in class the question: How successfully do currently accepted economic principles account for the economic data? This is perhaps the most important aspect of this course, for it is in the comparison of theory against

actuality that you will achieve true learning and develop the skills of critical thinking. Such skills will serve you well throughout your life.

Since the early seventies there has been worldwide economic "turmoil". We now face economic stagnation, an ecological crisis, the simultaneous occurrence of inflation and unemployment, resource shortages, an energy crisis, huge balance of payments deficits and mounting foreign debts in Third World countries, the impact of multinational corporations on our jobs, decay of our communities and much more. These economic problems are the underlying cause of many political and social disorders and unrest at home and abroad. These solutions require correct understandIng of the root-causes of these problems. Since every social problem is multifaceted, we cannot tackle our difficulties from only one angle and expect to comprehend; rather we must examine these problems from a variety of perspectives. We live in exciting times, for not only do we as people confront and debate the difficult questions already mentioned but surely we shall soon confront new problems. Our survival on this planet depends not only on how fast, but also how well we solve our dilemmas. By taking this course, you can contribute to the debate. When seen as a problem-solving science wrestling with difficult, urgent problems which affect all our lives, economics becomes challenging, rewarding, creative, and imaginative.

To achieve our goal, your participation is crucial; remember, it is your learning at stake. Learning wil be limited if we conduct this class in the paternalistic belief that knowledge flows only in one direction--from teacher to student. When you entered the university, you became a member of community of scholars, the same community to which your instructor belongs. Both of us have the privilege to work within this scholarly community and both of us have the obligation to contribute to its success. Maximum learning, and hence maximum success, will be attained in an environment where the teacher sees his own knowledge as a trust for the students, sees the learning process as a mutual experience, and encourages self-discipline, and serious, hard work by his own example. You are strongly encouraged to criticize the ideas, principles, facts, and even the teaching process itself; without constructive criticism from orur friends, we are all blind to those faults and shortcomings within ourselves which retard the advancement of orur knowledge and understanding. Your criticism must be constructive (not negative) so that we can all learn from it. The most effective way foryou to help improve the teaching and learning process is not by general criticism, but by citing and analyzing specific instances of what you find wanting. positive criticism is not just saying that something is good or bad, but instead how and why it is good or bad and how it could be improved.

English is not my native tongue and at first you will find my speech pattern unfamiliar; I ask that you pay particularly close attention until you become accustomed to my speaking manner. For my part, I regret that "uncustomary" sounds may

impede communication between us, and I will cheerfully and gratefully accept correction of my pronunciation. Above all, if you do not understand, immediately ask for clarification. This last admonition applies to more than my English usage--ask about anything you do not understand.

As I have said above, accomplishment of your goal (whatever that may be) largely depends on you. The instructor and your textbook can only guide you through the jungle of economic principles and facts. But it is you who will read, learn, think, and ask questions. Through all these exercises you will develop the skill of critical thinking and you will be able to synthesize your learning in a way that is useful to you.

From reading this syllabus, you now understand that this course is not a "traditional" one and that I am not a "traditional" instructor. To reinforce our learning and critical thinking, a lot of new things will be tried throughout the course; some of these innovations will come from you. We usually try to use essay questions as much as possible, rather than the multiple-choice or true-false format. Writing essays will undoubtedly aid development of your written communication skills.

For this course, I strongly urge you to read regularly at least one of the following periodicals: a. The Wall Street Journal (daily); b. Business Week (weekly); c. Dollars and Sense (monthly). Reading about the real economy and real economic events is stimulating, and will reinforce and complement the more formal class instruction. In addition, I feel that economics should be a tool for understanding society and reading the above periodicals encourages you to be informed and aware of what is going on in the world. I myself benefit immensely from reading a dozen periodicals, and I use them in my teaching.

My concluding comment is that the classroom is an agora where every opinion and fact can and must be freely discussed regardless of how elementary the topic or how ideological the point of view. The truth can be established only through the free exchange of ideas, and this exchange needs your active participation. Remember: Learning is give and take.

TESTS, HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENTS, AND GRADING:

Despite the fact that I try to follow a slightly different approach to learning economics, I still must give you grades to evaluate your performance in the course. That is, since the school requires letter grades and since your prospective employers expect me to evaluate you for them, your performance will be judged according to your ability to learn certain materials as well as your contribution to the learning of your fellow students. Form the work outlined below, you will receive letter grades to indicate your performance in the course.

Though class attendance is not required, you are expected to attend the class and participate in discussions, except for illness and other emergencies. This is not a course which can be completed by taking tests (for this the school offers the CLEP option), rather it is a course which requires your active involvement in teaching, learning and discussion activities.

The above is a general outline for the course. A working outline(weekly assignments, quizzes and tests) will be detailed for you in class. It would be very much appreciated if all out-of-class assignments were typed and deadlines for them strictly observed.

	Weight
Reaction Essays.....	33%
Mid-term Exam.....	33%
Final Exam.....	33%

Thank you for being with me and giving me this opportunity to both teach with you.

TEXTS: [1]: Economics: Principles of Political Economy. By Daniel R. Fusfeld. Scott, Foresman and Company, 1982.

[2]: Capitalism For Beginners, by Robert Lekachmant and Boris Van Loon. Pantheon Books,1981.

[3]: Shrinking Dollars and Vanishing Jobs: Why the Economy Isn't Working for You. By Dick Cluster/Nancy Rutter. Beacon Press, 1980.

[4]: Economic Issues Today: Alternative Approaches. By Robert B. Carson. St. Martin's Press, 2nd ed. (1980).

[5]: Shifting Sands: A Long View of the U.S. Economy. A Dollars and Sense pamphlet, July-August 1982 special issue.

COURSE OUTLINE:

I. The Economic System: Some Basic Foundations
   1.1 Introduction to the course
   [1]: "Introduction"
   [3]: "Introduction
   Reprint*: "Preface to the Student."

   1.2 Place of economics in the social sciences and paradigms in economics
   Reprint*: "Economics as a Social Science."
   Reprint*: "Alternative Economic Philosophies."

1.3 The evolution of economic systems and the evolution of the human-being.
Reprint*: "The Evolution of Economic Systems."
Hand-out: "Different Forms of Social Organization"

II. **Development of Capitalism in the United States and its Critique**

2.1 From competition to monopoly: Emergence of bug business in the United States.
Reprint*: "Concentration in the Economy," by Gardner Means.
[1]: Chs. 20 & 23
[3]: Ch. 5
[4]: Issue 4.

2.2 Development of trade unions and their role and function in the economy.
[1]: Ch. 26.
[4]: Issue 7.

2.3 Capitalism and income distribution: toward two classes and poverty/wealth.
[1]: Ch. 28.
[4]: Issue 8.
(Note: At this juncture we should discuss Norman C. Miller's article on big business and its implications to our political system.)

2.4 The role of government in the capitalist society.
[1]: pp. 24-28.
[3]: Ch. 4.
[4]: Issue 13.

2.5 The fundamentals of the markets and the market economy.
[1]: pp. 10-24, Chs. 2 & 3.

2.6 Marxian or radical critiques of capitalism
[2]: Read the entire book and consult pp.145-53 for important terms and concepts used in the book.
[1]: Ch. 27.
Hand-out: "Marxian Analysis of Capitalism"

Mid-term Exam and other assignments for this part of the course will be announced in class ahead of time. Note: Materials that will be covered beyond this point will be included in final examination.

III. **Principles of Economic Decision-making in Business and in Households: A Microeconomic Analysis**

3.1 The fundamentals of competitive markets
[1]: Chs. 15-19, except Appendix 16A nad 16B
Hand-out: "The Anatomy of A Market System: An Overview"

Hand-out: "Review of Supply and Demand"
Hand-out: "Supply and Demand: Elasticity Coefficient and Its Applications"

3.2 Non-competitive markets and their implications
[1]: Chs. 21 & 22
[4]: Issue 5.
Discussion on regulations: Miscellaneous newspaper articles.

IV. The American Economy within the Context of World Economy

4.1 The political economy of giant corporations: The emergence and the power of the multinational corporations
[3]: "Glossary of Commonly Used Terms."
[4]: Issue 6: "The Multinational Firm."
Reprint*: "The Global Reach," by Richard Barnet and Ronald Muller.
Reprint*: "Life on the Global Assembly Line," by Barbara Ehrenreich and Annette Fuentes.
[3]: Ch. 6: "Getting Rich on Foreign Soil."

4.2 International economic relations and economic interdependence: The American performance and crisis in international relations
[1]: Chs. 37 & 38.
[3]: Ch. 7 and "Glossary of Commonly Used Terms."
[4]: Issue 15.
[5]: Read entire issue.

Final examination covers part III and IV materials only. Exam time: 6:00pm, Thursday, December 15. Room number will be determined later.

(*) All starred materials are on reserve in the library, at the circulation desk.

Student Assistant: Pat Schulte
Office Hours: 1:30-2:30 TR
Office: 290I Gamble Hall
PHONE: 777-3348 or 2637

Economics 201
Fall, 1983

REACTION ESSAYS

I. Essay is precisely what its name indicates - it is your reaction to the articles that you have read. It is not intended to be a summary of the article.

II. Therefore, read the article and write a reactoin paper (position paper) focused on that article.
   1. State agreement or disagreement (like or dislike).
   2. Support your argument:
      a. Either through points presented in the article or through supplementary information - other articles, statistical data, etc.
      b. If you use outside sources, please list these sources. It is not necessary to use precise footnote notation - just indicate your sources.

III. Mechanics:
   1. Approximately one page in length.
   2. Typed, double-spaced.

IV. "To achieve clarity, good writing must be precise in its words, free of ambiguity, orderly in its presentation of ideas, economical in expression, smooth in flow, and considerate of its readers. A successful writer invites readers to read, encourages them to continue, and makes their task agreeable by leading them from thought to thought in a manner that evolve form clear thinking and logical development." (Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2nd Ed.), 1976, p. 25).

These essays are not intended to be mechanical exercises. They are for the purpose of stretching your mind - so have fun with them.

DUE DATES OF THE ESSAYS

Part One :	September 9
Part Two :	September 16
Part Three:	October 7
Part Four:	October 4
Part Five:	October 21
Part Six:	November 4
Part Seven:	November 18
Part Eight:	December 2

Author Biographical Note

Fikret Ceyhun is a Professor in the Department of Economics at the University of North Dakota. Dr. Ceyhun has a Ph.D. in Economics from Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan. During his tenure at UND he has taught a variety of courses and involved in teaching and advising in the Honors Program. He is a member of the Graduate Faculty and also a field faculty advisor in economics for Vermont College of Norwick University for Midwest. He is a member of various professional organizations and also a member of editorial board of the Review of Radical Political Economics. He is co-chair of the Program Committee of the Union for Radical Political Economics for the Allied Social Science Association conference. Currently he is doing research in the areas of multinational corporations and Turkish economic development.